



US006493682B1

(12) **United States Patent**
Horrigan et al.

(10) **Patent No.:** **US 6,493,682 B1**
(45) **Date of Patent:** **Dec. 10, 2002**

(54) **OPTIMAL ORDER CHOICE: EVALUATING
 UNCERTAIN DISCOUNTED TRADING
 ALTERNATIVES**

(75) Inventors: **Holly T. Horrigan**, Raleigh, NC (US);
John K. Wald, Hoboken, NJ (US)

(73) Assignee: **Pendelton Trading Systems, Inc.**,
 Hoboken, NJ (US)

(*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this
 patent is extended or adjusted under 35
 U.S.C. 154(b) by 0 days.

(21) Appl. No.: **09/396,647**

(22) Filed: **Sep. 15, 1999**

Related U.S. Application Data

(60) Provisional application No. 60/100,381, filed on Sep. 15,
 1998.

(51) Int. Cl.⁷ **G06F 17/60**

(52) U.S. Cl. **705/36; 705/36; 705/35;**
705/37

(58) Field of Search **705/35, 36, 37**

(56) **References Cited**

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

5,819,237 A * 10/1998 Garman 705/36
 6,078,904 A * 6/2000 Rebane 705/36

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

WO WO 01/09698 A2 * 8/2001

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Patrick Sandas, Estimating Models of Price Formation in
 Pure Limit Order Markets, Dec. 1998, Doctoral Dissertation,
 pp. 1-7.*

Tradeworx Press Releases to Sep. 30, 1999 and TREQ
 description.*

Figlewski, Stephen, 1997, Forecasting volatility, *Financial
 Markets, Institutions & Instruments*, 6(1), 1-88.

Harris, Lawrence and Joel Hasbrouck, 1996, Market vs.
 limit orders: The SuperDot evidence on order submission
 strategy, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 31,
 213-231.

Hausman, J., A. Lo, and C. MacKinlay, 1992, An ordered
 profit analysis of transaction stock prices, *Journal of Finan-
 cial Economics*, 31, 319-379.

Lin, Ji-Chai and Michael S. Rozeff, 1994, Variance, return,
 and high-low price spreads, *The Journal of Financial
 Research*, 17(3), 301-319.

Merton, Robert C., *Journal of Economic Theory*, 3,
 373-413.

Pratt, John W., 1964, Risk aversion in the small and in the
 large, *Econometrica*, 32, 83-97.

Simaana, Yusif, Daniel G. Weaver, and David K. Whitcomb,
 1998, The Quotation Behavior of ENCS and Nasdaq Market
 Makers, Fordham University working paper.

* cited by examiner

Primary Examiner—Vincent Millin

Assistant Examiner—Charles R. Kyle

(74) *Attorney, Agent, or Firm*—McDonnell Boehnen
 Hulbert & Berghoff

(57) **ABSTRACT**

The present invention provides a method for determining
 whether to execute an order (or list of orders) immediately,
 or delay execution in exchange for a possible price savings.
 The method's generality enables the investor to optimize
 order decisions given individual beliefs about expected
 security returns and variance, risk aversion, and portfolio
 investment goals. Starting from an expected utility
 framework, the method maximizes the expected gains asso-
 ciated with trading. The method encompasses the case in
 which the investor plans to trade the security within a
 specified trading window as well as the case in which trading
 occurs only at attractive prices. Additionally, under the
 assumption of constant absolute risk aversion, the method
 resembles a traditional mean-variance analysis commonly
 used in equity portfolio management. The method also
 generalizes to handle the case of multiple orders and enables
 an investor to consider an order strategy taking overall
 portfolio risk into account. The method also can be used in
 conjunction with dynamic cost control techniques.

The method of the invention is the first such method to
 consider the maximization of gains in an order context as a
 function of both returns and the probability of the order
 being executed. This method is also unique in that it
 simultaneously accounts for the opportunity costs and the
 adverse selection costs of using discounted, uncertain orders
 such as equity limit orders, POSIT® trades, equity principal
 order trading, etc.

31 Claims, No Drawings

US-PAT-NO: 6493682

DOCUMENT-IDENTIFIER: US 6493682 B1

TITLE: Optimal order choice: evaluating uncertain discounted trading alternatives

----- KWIC -----

Brief Summary Text - BSTX (91):

In order to determine the successful execution of these hypothetical limit orders, we compare the limit price with the price stream reported by TAQ throughout the trade period. When the price history shows that the price crosses the limit price, we assume that the limit order fills. When the price history does not reach the limit price, we assume that the order does not fill. However, when the minimum (maximum) price exactly equals the purchase (sale)

limit price, it is less clear whether we should assume the trade fills. We address this issue by examining the 1991 TORQ database containing actual limit order execution data. We examine those 7 securities in the TORQ which overlapped our random 100 stock sample. (One could also use actual limit orders from the TORQ data base for this analysis, but a number of possible biases would exist with such a procedure. First, while the TORQ provides thousands of limit orders, many of the observations are not independent. That is, only one buy limit order per stock per day is an independent observation. Second, limit orders are often canceled or changed; any feasible analysis would choose a sample of unchanged orders, and this sample may be biased.) For these

7 securities, we examined all of the `good-until-canceled` and `day-orders` placed from November 1991 through January 1992. The analysis is presented in

Example 1, below. The results demonstrate that, on average, 70% of the limit orders placed were at least partially filled when the trade record showed a price exactly equal to, but not beyond, the limit order price within the trade period. This is consistent with Lo, MacKinlay, and Zhang (1997), who calculated similar statistics using an industry data set. Since we will use the simplification that order size is small (and therefore s is approximately equal to 1), we will also assume that a limit order fills if the price stream crosses the limit price, that it fills 70% of the time if the price stream